(ase 8	8:08-cr-	00237-[OOC	Docume	ent 9	Filed	09/22/0	8	Page 1 of 4	Page ID #:24	
1 2 3 4 5										6	'O''	
6 7												
8					UNITE	ED ST	TATE!	S DIST	ΊRΙ	CT COURT		
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA											
10												
11	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Case No.: SACR 08-237											
12						Plair	ntiff,	{	Οŀ	RDER OF DI	ETENTION	
13	vs.							{				
1415	JAM	JAMES RICHARD HALSTEAD, Defendant.										
16								_)				
17								I.				
18	A.	()	On m	otion	of the C	Gover	nmen	t in a c	ase	e allegedly in	volving:	
19		1.	()	a cri	me of v	iolen	ce.					
20		2.	()							•	prisonment or death.	
21		3.	()					d subst	ano	ce offense wi	th maximum sentence	3
22					en or mo	-						
23		4.	()						COI	nvicted of tw	o or more prior	
24		.	()		nses des						1 1 1	
25		5.	()	•	•						plence that involves a	
26 27						-					n or destructive devic	e
2728					ny otner C. § 22:		cious	weapo	11,	or a ranure id	register under 18	
∠ ∪				U.S.	C. 8 44.							

1	B.	(X) On motion by the Government/() on Court's own motion, in a case							
2			allegedly involving:						
3		(X)	On the further allegation by the Government of:						
4			1. (X) a serious risk that the defendant will flee.						
5			2. () a serious risk that the defendant will:						
6			a. () obstruct or attempt to obstruct justice.						
7			b. () threaten, injure or intimidate a prospective witness or						
8			juror, or attempt to do so.						
9	C.	The C	e Government () is/ (X) is not entitled to a rebuttable presumption that no						
10		cond	condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the defendant's						
11		appearance as required and the safety or any person or the community.							
12									
13			II.						
14	A.	(X)	The Court finds that no condition or combination of conditions will						
15			reasonably assure:						
16		1.	(X) the appearance of the defendant as required.						
17			(X) and/or						
18		2.	(X) the safety of any person or the community.						
19	B.	()	The Court finds that the defendant has not rebutted by sufficient evidence						
20			to the contrary the presumption provided by statute.						
21									
22			III.						
23		The C	Court has considered:						
24	A.	(X)	the nature and circumstances of the offense(s) charged, including whether						
25			the offense is a crime of violence, a Federal crime of terrorism, or involves						
26			a minor victim or a controlled substance, firearm, explosive, or destructive						
27			device;						
28	B.	(X)	the weight of evidence against the defendant;						
			Page 2 of 4						

- C. (X) the history and characteristics of the defendant; and
- D. (X) the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or the community.

IV.

The Court also has considered all the evidence adduced at the hearing and the arguments and/or statements of counsel, and the Pretrial Services

Report/recommendation.

V.

The Court bases the foregoing finding(s) on the following:

- A. (X) As to flight risk: Defendant has nothing to lose by fleeing because he has a \$66 million dollar civil judgment against him and is facing a prison sentence of approximately ten years if convicted. Further, according to the Government's proffer, Defendant recently made comments that indicate he intends to flee and has hidden some of the victim's unrecovered funds, which he can then use to cover his expenses if he becomes a fugitive. Defendant's admitted depression, history of using illegal drugs, and daily drinking habit indicate Defendant is mentally unstable and is not likely to comply with conditions of release. Defendant has also failed to proffer adequate bail resources or sureties.
- B. (X) As to danger: The nature of the charged offenses as set forth in the original complaint and grand jury's indictment, combined with Defendant's criminal history (which includes a 1998 state conviction for engaging in another fraudulent investment scheme), demonstrate Defendant has learned nothing from his past criminal punishment, and that his 1998 conviction was not a sufficient deterrent. To the contrary, the pending charges in the grand jury indictment and Defendant's 1998 conviction actually demonstrate that, in the six-to-eight year period following Defendant's

1	1998 conviction, Defendant has simply refined the nature of his swindles
2	and has moved on to higher-yielding fraudulent schemes.
3	
4	VI.
5	A. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the defendant be detained prior to trial.
6	B. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the defendant be committed to the custody of
7	the Attorney General for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the
8	extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in
9	custody pending appeal.
10	C. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the defendant be afforded reasonable
11	opportunity for private consultation with counsel.
12	D. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, on order of a Court of the United States or on
13	request of any attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the
14	corrections facility in which defendant is confined deliver the defendant to a
15	United States marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court
16	proceeding.
17	
18 19	DATED: September 22, 2008 /s/ Arthur Nakazato ARTHUR NAKAZATO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	